REMARKS

Claims 2-9 and 11-40 are pending in this application. Claims 3, 6-9, 12 and 14-40 stand withdrawn from consideration. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 10 have been canceled and claims 2, 3, 5, 8, 11-13 and 16 have been amended. Support for the amendments to claims 2 and 11 can be found at least at in original claims 1 and 11, respectively, as well as at least at pg. 21, line 18 - pg. 22, line 10. Claims 3, 5, 8, 12, 13 and 16 have been amended to change the dependencies of these claims in view of the cancellation of claims 1 and 10 and/or to maintain consistency with the amendments to claims 2 and 11. Thus, no new matter is added.

I. Election of Species Requirement

In response to the June 13, 2008 Election of Species Requirement, Applicants elected Species I, Figs. 1-3, with traverse. Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 11 and 13 continue to read on the elected Species, and at least claim 1 is generic to all species. As noted above, claims 3, 6-9, 12 and 14-40 stand withdrawn from consideration. Applicants respectfully request rejoinder of the withdrawn claims upon the allowance of independent claim 1.

Claim 4 has not been indicated as being withdrawn from consideration. However, claim 4 has not been substantively rejected. Therefore, Applicants assume that claim 4 is also withdrawn and has been indicated as such in the attached listing of claims.

II. 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 11-224043 to Tanabe et al. (hereinafter "Tanabe"). Claims 1 and 10 have been canceled. The rejection of claims 2, 5, 11 and 13 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 2, as amended, recites, in part, "a process of projecting a laser beam for reproduction having the same projection condition as that of the reference beam is projected onto the deposited holographic recording layers, the diffraction beams generated in the

respective holographic recording layers at the same time by the projected beam are detected by two-dimensional photodetectors a number of which is equal to that of the holographic recording layers, thereby simultaneously reproducing pieces of information from light-detecting signals of the two-dimensional photodetectors."

Claim 11, as amended, recites, in part, "the reproducing laser optical system is configured to make the laser beam for reproduction be projected onto the deposited holographic recording layers with the same projection condition as that of the reference beam so as to generate the diffraction beams in the respective holographic recording layers at the same time, and the two-dimensional photodetectors are configured to simultaneously detect diffraction beams generated in the respective holographic recording layers by the projected beams."

Tanabe fails to disclose generation of diffraction beams in holographic recording layers at the same time and simultaneous detection of the diffraction beams by two-dimensional photodetectors. The system of claim 11 and the method of claim 2 produce significant improvements in recording density and data transfer rate of the multilayer holographic recording medium.

Therefore, independent claims 2 and 11 are patentable over Tanabe. Claims 3-8 are also patentable for at least their various dependencies from claim 2 as well as for the additional features they recite. Claims 12-16 are also patentable for at least their various dependencies from claim 11 as well as for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

Srikant Viswanadham Registration No. 60,111

JAO:SQV/hs

Date: February 27, 2009

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. Box 320850 Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850

Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461